

Remarks

The Examiner allowed claims 14-16, 18-19, 21 and 25-26. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowed subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-13, 17, 20 and 31-36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The Examiner notes that claims 10, 17 and 33 appear to be allowable over the prior art if amendments addressing the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph were made.

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by "Void Warranty", Marcos, MaxPc, October 2000, www.maxpc.co.uk, herein referred to as "Void Warranty" article.

Applicants respectfully traverse the §112 and §102 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-13, 17, 20 and 31-36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner argues that "[t]he claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly added limitation of "inside each layer" does not appear to be described in the specification."

In response, Applicants have amended the specification to replace "within" by "inside" in the indicated paragraphs beginning page 10, line 10. For example, "the traces 125 within the layer 128" has been changed by the amendment herein to "the traces 125 inside the layer 128". Applicants respectfully contend that the preceding amendment to the specification does not add new matter, because FIG. 9 clearly shows that the traces 125 are inside the layer 128. Thus, the phrase "inside each layer" of claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-13, 17, 20 and 31-36 is now tracked accurately in the specification by the phrase "inside the layer 128".

Based on the preceding argument, Applicants respectfully contend that claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-13, 17, 20 and 31-36 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-13, 17, 20 and 31-36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph be withdrawn.

09/717,698

11

35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by "Void Warranty", Marcos, MaxPc, October 2000, www.maxpc.co.uk, herein referred to as "Void Warranty" article.

Since claim 3 has been canceled, Applicants respectfully contend that the rejection of claim 3 is moot.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or Deposit Account 09-0457.

Date: 09/22/2005

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850